

**REMARKS**

The examiner rejected claims 1, 6-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Joshi et al., and rejected claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cabral, Jr., et al. The examiner objected to claims 2-5 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The examiner indicated, however, that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have canceled claims 1, 6-9 and 11. In addition, applicants have amended dependent claim 2 into independent form, incorporating into that claim all limitations from its base claim – claim 1 (now canceled). Applicants amended claim 10 to depend upon amended claim 2. As a result, applicants respectfully request the examiner to allow amended claim 2, and those claims that depend upon it (i.e., dependent claims 3-5 and amended claim 10), to issue along with previously allowed claims 12-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2005

  
Mark Seeley  
Reg. No: 32,299  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Intel Corporation  
Mail Stop SC4-202  
2200 Mission College Blvd.  
Santa Clara, CA 95052-8119  
(408) 765-7382

- 6 -

LJV/cak (10/01/97)

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

(37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

(37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

UNRECORDED COPY OF TRANSMISSION

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

(37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on February 15, 2005.

Mark Seeley  
Name of Person Sending Facsimile

[Signature]  
Signature